UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION P.O. BOX 956 BLDG. 1, MAIL STOP A109 EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956

MAILED

AUG 2 1 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of John Border, et al.

Application No. 09/905,215

Filed: June 13, 2001

Attorney Docket No. PD-201021

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition, filed November 9, 2007, which is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.181 (no fee) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application. The delay in responding is regretted; however, the petition was recently referred to the Office of Petition for consideration.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Jeffrey J. Howell appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application was held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue and publication fees on or before August 13, 2007, as required by the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due (Notice), mailed May 11, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on September 6, 2007.

Petitioner asserts that the Notice dated May 11, 2007 was not received.

A review of the application file reveals no irregularities in the mailing of the Notice mailed May 11, 2007. Thus, there is a strong presumption that the correspondence was properly mailed to the applicant at the correspondence address of record. In the absence of demonstrated irregularities in mailing of this Notice, petitioner must submit evidence to overcome this presumption. The following showing is required:

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

Petitioner has adequately supported his claim of non-receipt with such evidence.

In view of the above, the Notice of Abandonment is hereby <u>vacated</u> and the holding of abandonment withdrawn.

The application is being referred to the Office of Data Management to be processed into a patent.

Telephone inquires related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. Telephone inquiries related to processing as a patent should be directed to (571) 272-4200.

Sherry D. Brinkley
Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions